DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 219 CS 210 506

AUTHOR Marsh, David D.; And Others
TITLE Factors Influencing the Transfer of Bay Area Writing Workshop Experiences to Classrooms.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Criteria; Inservice Teacher Education; Program Development; Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; Staff Development; *Teacher Workshops; *Teaching Methods; *Writing Instruction; Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS *Bay Area Writing Project; Dependents Schools

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine the extent of implementation of the Bay Area Writing Program (BAWP) and how the extent varied for different components of the program or for the elementary versus secondary level. The role of staff development in helping teachers use the program--which emphasizes prewriting, writing, and rewriting phases--was also examined. The study took place within the Department of Defense Dependent Schools (DODDS) system in Europe. Representative teachers from four inservice programs participated, and an interview was conducted with each teacher to determine the extent to which several components of the BAWP had been implemented in the teacher's classroom and the teacher's ideas about what had helped or hindered the process. Each participant's use (1) of the writing process, (2) of peer response groups, and (3) of writing with students was also determined. Another interview obtained qualitative data concerning teachers' beliefs, characteristics, and the organizational factors that influenced the extent and nature of implementation. Differences in implementation by workshop mode were statistically significant for both elementary and secondary teachers. The extent of implementation of the BAWP components was clearly linked to the intensity of the staff development mode. (Twenty references are included.) (AEW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED282219

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FACTORS INFLUENCING THE TRANSFER OF BAY AREA WRITING WORKSHOP EXPERIENCES TO CLASSROOMS

David D. Marsh
Debra J. Knudsen
Gene A. Knudsen

University of Southern California

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David D. Marsh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A paper presented in the symposium on inservice education in reading and writing instruction at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Washington, D.C., April, 1987.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS210506

Background

The Bay Area Writing Project has been an important and popular new perspective on the teaching of writing in elementary and secondary schools. From its inception, the Bay Area Writing Project has supported a general philosophy about the teaching of writing that includes these tenets:

1. Writing is a complicated process that can best be taught in a series of small steps.

2. There are no narrow formulas or simple prepackaged methods for successfully teaching writing.

3. If a technique for teaching writing works in the classroom, use it.

4. Students should be required to do a lot of writing.

5. Students should respond to each other's papers; it develops their critical faculties.

6. Grammar and spelling are not top priorities. Thinking, organizing and stringing sentences together come first.

7. Successful teachers of writing can be identified.

8. The best teacher of writing teachers is another writing teacher.

9. We know a great deal about writing research but most teachers are not aware of nor using this research.

10. Writing teachers must write. (Gray, 1983)

These tenets have been the basis of numerous summer institutes for teachers. At the institutes, carefully selected teachers work together to write and critique each others writing, to share teaching strategies that have worked effectively for them, and to discuss recent research on writing and the teaching of writing.

The tenets have also guided the teaching of writing in classrooms where the process of writing has been emphasized that includes prewriting, writing and rewriting phases. Communication rather than grammar and punctuation has received priority in an environment that has encouraged collegial examination and review of writing efforts.

Scriven (1979) directed a three-year study of the BAWP in a study funded by the Carnegie Foundation. Although the student performance component of the evaluation was not definitive, the program, as compared with other writing improvement efforts was called by Scriven, "the best large scale effort to improve composition now in operation in this country." He went on to add, "We looked at comparable English projects, but they were single-thrust approaches" unlike the many-faceted BAWP approach. He described BAWP as "impressive, with a highly intelligent approach." (Scriven, 1979, p.14).

The BAWP program has been popular as well as important. From its initial base at multiple sites in California, BAWP has expanded across the nation with support from the National Endowment for the Humanities (Gray, 1983). By 1983, the project had become the National Writing Project with "branches" in 117 universities and major educational agencies in 44 states. The program was also being applied in Canada, England, Australia, Sweden, Finland, West Germany, and in the Department of Defense Dependent Schools--DODDS. (Gray, 1983).

How teachers implement the Bay Area Writing Project is an

intriguing problem for staff development researchers, for several reasons. First, the innovation is not a packaged program and requires teachers to make a fundamental shift in their teaching. The importance of having teachers develop an understanding that is "beyond the surface curriculum" has been emphasized by Bussis, Chittenden, and Amarel (1976) and Fullan (1982). Duffy and Roehler (1986) have studied the difficulties of helping teachers make paradigm shifts in their teaching of reading. The Bay Area Writing Project is not a packaged program which teachers could implement with fidelity. Instead, it is a set of general approaches to the teaching of writing that often involve teachers in making a paradigm shift in their approach to the teaching of writing.

A second reason that the Bay Area Writing Project is intriguing to staff development researchers is the nature of staff development that it represents. The Bay Area Writing Project was seen as highly successful by practitioners and researchers (Scriven, 1979) yet the staff development does not follow the training model proposed by Joyce and Showers (1980, 1982) and Showers (1985), or the staff development model synthesized by Sparks (1983). While the BAWP does provide credible instructors who were teachers of writing, emulation of successful practice, and extensive assistance in the implementation phase a la the DESSI study (Crandall, Bauchner, Loucks, & Schmidt, 1982; Huberman & Miles, 1984), the BAWP does not include other features from that study which were found

critical to successful implementation.

This apparently successful anomaly in the staff development/ program implementation literature deserves further study. One theme that needs to be explored is the extent that the BAWP has actually been implemented in classrooms, and whether the level of implementation varies by the component of the innovation. If the BAWP is a loose set of components rather than a tightly packaged program, one would expect that it might be more unevenly implemented-- especially if some components require more of a paradigm shift on the part of many teachers than do other components. It also isn't clear if the BAWP can be equally implemented in elementary and secondary schools. The program literature suggests that implementing programs in secondary schools is quite different than implementing them in elementary schools (Huberman & Miles, 1984; Marsh, 1987).

The way teachers learn how to carry out major components of the BAWP is also not clear. Several modes of staff development for the BAWP have evolved-- an intensive summer institute, a less intense series of workshops during the school year, and a quick overview of the BAWP provided in a short session. The extent to which each of these is related to implementation of various BAWP program components is not clear, nor is it known what staff development or local context factors are perceived to assist teachers in implementing the BAWP components.

Purpose of the Study

The first purpose of the study was to examine the extent of

implementation of the BAWP, and how the extent of implementation varied for different components of the program or for the elementary vs. secondary level of the teacher. The second purpose was to examine the role staff development played in helping teachers use the program. More specifically, the second purpose was to see if the extent of implementation varied by the mode of staff development provided and what implementation factors teachers perceived were critical in assisting them in implementing the program. Examining staff development in this way allowed for inspection of the ways staff development was helpful (as perceived by teachers) as well as its impact on extent of implementation of the program.

The research questions for the study were:

1. To what extent were various components of the Bay Area Writing Project implemented in classrooms?
2. Did the extent and configuration of implementation vary by the workshop mode or the elementary vs. secondary level of the teacher?
3. How did staff development workshop features, local organizational factors or the nature of technical assistance influence the extent and nature of implementation?

More generally, the study was intended to shed light on how teachers implement innovations that are not tightly packaged programs but which require teachers to make paradigm shifts in their approach to teaching.

Methodology

The study took place within the DODDS school system in Europe. Representatives of 4 groups of teachers participated in the study including graduates of the intensive summer institutes, the open program set of workshops during the school year, the brief inservice training during the school year, and a control group.

A structured interview was conducted with each teacher to determine the extent to which several components of the BAWP had been implemented in the teacher's classroom and the teacher's perception as to what factors helped or hindered the implementation process. The extent of implementation for each BAWP component was assessed by certified interviewer/raters using the LoU framework developed by the CBAM project at the Texas R&D Center. An extensive description of the methodology is provided in Knudsen and Knudsen (1985).

Treatments. There were three modes of staff development given to teachers regarding the BAWP project. The most intense was the annual Summer Institute which met five days a week for three weeks, and involved approximately 25 volunteer but carefully selected teachers from grades K-13. Participants spent their days observing and presenting various methods of teaching writing that had been found to be successful in their classrooms. Presentations by the participants were supplemented by guest speakers and institute organizers who added approaches not covered by the participants including current research findings concerning the teaching of composition. In that way,

participants received a wide range of theories and ideas to weigh and debate.

Teachers wrote extensively and shared their work with other teachers in writing response groups that met during the afternoon throughout the Institute. A supportive, cooperative environment was established for writing and critiquing others' writing.

Institute graduates prepared and presented writing inservice training to other teachers and attended one- or two-day annual follow-up meetings so as to keep in touch with recent developments in the field of composition, continue personal writing, and coordinate future inservice projects. Institute graduates also maintained informal networking in the form of personal correspondence and telephone trees. In many instances, graduates coordinated their efforts with other Institute graduates to offer the Open Program or Orientation Workshop at their home school site.

The second mode of staff development was the Open Program. These programs were usually held during the school year and were taught by full-time classroom teachers who had successfully completed the three-week Summer Institute, including graduates who had developed a variety of special writing interest areas such as the use of writing folders, journals, peer response groups, research papers, or evaluation programs. Enrollment in the Open Program was open to everyone in the DODDS region and typically included from 15 to 35 participants from a variety of grade levels and subject areas. Open Program participants were

not chosen or selected as were Institute participants.

The Open Programs involved 30 class contact hours during a period of one to three months. The content and typical activities of the Open Program were similar to those of the Institute but, because of time restrictions, there were fewer participant presentations and less writing took place.

The third mode of staff development was the one-day orientation workshop which was provided at the request of school administrators or teachers at a given site. The workshops were provided by Institute graduates and typically took place on a week day set aside by the home school as a teacher inservice day. In some cases, inservice training was provided by one Institute graduate for a small school with as few as 8 teachers, and in other cases involved as many as 6 Institute graduates working with over 150 teachers from several schools.

Inservice training days were fashioned according to the desires and needs of the teachers in the requesting schools. Presentation on many topics were available. Some of the most often requested presentations included: responding to student writing, teaching writing across the curriculum, stimulating fluency, and using writing response groups.

Sampling. The Department of Defense Dependents School system (DoDDS) is worldwide. This school system operates to provide American education to over 150,000 dependents of U.S. military and civilian personnel in five regions: Germany, Mediterranean, Atlantic, Pacific, and Panama. DoDDS-Germany

(DoDDS-G) is the most heavily populated region with 90 elementary schools and 51 middle and/or high schools. Students attending these schools number 85,600. There are 4,328 teachers, principals, and other staff members working in American schools in Germany at present.

The possible population for Institute participants was 92: for the Open Program, 203, and over 2,000 for Limited Inservice. From each of these possible populations five elementary and five secondary teachers were selected as participants in this study. Of the remaining approximately 1,332 teachers who had not had previous Writing Project inservice, five elementary and five secondary teachers were chosen and acted as a comparison group for this study. In short, forty teachers participated in the study. An important caveat in the study is that since the teachers were not randomly assigned to staff development treatments, differences attributed to staff development modes may be due instead to differences in teachers or other variables.

The sample number of five elementary and five secondary teachers from each of the four categories was chosen because it was necessary to do indepth interviews to find out in detail how teachers implemented writing strategies in their classrooms. Consequently, this study needed to emphasize depth rather than breadth of numbers.

Instrumentation. This study drew heavily on the works of Hall and Loucks (1977), and the dimension of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model known as Levels of Use (Loucks, Newlove, & Hall,

1975). A focused interview was conducted with each participant to answer research questions one and two. It was necessary to determine each participants' level of use (LoU) for three specific writing strategies: the writing process, peer response groups, and the teacher writing with students.

Three specific writing strategies were selected for this study based on the review of Bay Area Writing literature and suggestions made by Jim Gray, director of the BAWP, and three Bay area developers. These three writing strategies were considered major aspects of the writing Project. It was also determined by the developers and the researchers that three aspects could be examined in depth in a 45-60 minute interview.

A more open-ended interview obtained Qualitative data concerning teacher beliefs, teacher characteristics, and organizational factors that influenced the extent and nature of implementation. The combination of focused LoU interview and the more open-ended interview was preferred because it: permitted greater depth, allowed probing to obtain more complete data, made it possible to establish and maintain rapport, and provided a means of checking and assuring the effectiveness of communication between respondent and interviewer.

Although the National Writing Project was a non-packaged innovation in totality, specific writing strategies could be identified, described with innovation configurations, and measured for purposes of this study. Levels of Use (LoU) was employed to describe the behavior of individuals as they became

familiar with and skilled in using these three strategies. Fullan and Pomfret (1977) termed LoU "the most sophisticated and explicit conceptualization of 'the fidelity' orientation to assessing degree of implementation' (p. 355). This fidelity referred to the extent to which actual use of an innovation corresponded to intended or planned use (Fullan & Pomfret, 1977). The Lou portions of the interview used a branching format with specific questions and probes. Because the LoU interview was generic, it could be used with any innovation for which configurations or distinguishing characteristics were developed. The interviewees' fidelity to these configuration components determined the difference between use and nonuse. The LoU framework is presented in Figure 1. The Levels of Use interview was a focused interview designed to measure degree of implementation of an innovation. Tests for reliability and validity were conducted on the LoU interview (Hall, 1974; Loucks, 1977). Independent raters successfully classified 92 percent of the 1,381 tapes representing three innovations. Inter-rater reliabilities ranged from .85 to .95 on overall Level of Use. A validity study was conducted using ethnographic methodology. The ethnographers' ratings of Level of Use correlated .98 with the interviewers' ratings (Loucks, 1977). Data collectors in the study attended a three-day training session and were certified for Level of Use interviewing and the rating of interview tapes.

LoU interviews were conducted to answer research questions one and two. These two questions focused on the three specific

Figure 1

LEVELS OF USE OF THE INNOVATION: TYPICAL BEHAVIORS

	LEVEL OF USE	BEHAVIORAL INDICES OF LEVEL
USER	VI RENEWAL	THE USER IS SEEKING MORE EFFECTIVE ALTERNATIVES TO THE ESTABLISHED USE OF THE INNOVATION.
USER	V INTEGRATION	THE USER IS MAKING DELIBERATE EFFORTS TO COORDINATE WITH OTHERS IN USING THE INNOVATION.
USER	IVB REFINEMENT	THE USER IS MAKING CHANGES TO INCREASE OUTCOMES.
USER	IVA ROUTINE	THE USER IS MAKING FEW OR NO CHANGES AND HAS AN ESTABLISHED PATTERN OF USE.
USER	III MECHANICAL USE	THE USER IS MAKING CHANGES TO BETTER ORGANIZE USE OF THE INNOVATION.
NONUSER	II PREPARATION	THE INDIVIDUAL IS PREPARING TO USE THE INNOVATION.
NONUSER	I ORIENTATION	THE INDIVIDUAL IS SEEKING INFORMATION ABOUT THE INNOVATION.
NONUSER	0 NONUSE	NO ACTION IS BEING TAKEN WITH RESPECT TO THE INNOVATION.

Writing Project strategies: the writing process, peer response groups, and the teacher writing with the students. Innovation configurations of each of the three aspects were developed by the researchers after reviewing the literature on these aspects and obtaining answers to the following three questions from Bay Area developers:

A. What would you observe when the innovation is operational?

B. What would people be doing?

C. What are critical components of the innovation? (Hall & Loucks, 1978, pp. 11-12).

These configurations were written and used as guides during the LoU interviews and their subsequent ratings.

Immediately following the focused LoU interview, a more open-ended interview format was used to obtain factors which teachers perceived had helped or hindered implementation.. Factors described by Fullan (1982) and by Doyle and Ponder (1977-78) helped focus this part of the interview.

The interview guide was pilot tested using several teachers who had and had not received BAWP inservice but who were not a part of the sample. Moreover, developers of the Bay Area Writing Project and colleagues at our university reviewed a copy of the interview guide.

Data Collection. Interviews with participants were scheduled ahead of time by telephone, were conducted at a time that was convenient for the interviewee in a private setting, and

were tape-recorded. No participants who were contacted for this study refused to be interviewed.

Data Analysis. The rating of taped interviews was done by two CBAM trained raters at different times to insure inter-rater reliability. The tapes and notes made during the interviews provided a unique narrative of how teachers viewed the Writing Project experience.

The first and second research questions focused on the extent and configuration of implementation of three specific Writing Project strategies by participants. In order to answer these questions, data analysis using chi-square and the Friedman two-way analysis of variance were employed. These statistical treatments were used because the LoU information was ordinal data, not interval; therefore, analysis of variance techniques were not appropriate.

The last research question focused on factors that teachers perceived had helped or hindered implementation of the selected BAWP components. Following the interviews, answers were coded and content analyzed by the research team.

Findings

The first two tables portray the extent to which teachers implemented each of the three selected aspects of the BAWP innovation. For this analysis, teachers were not differentiated according to the type of inservice workshop they attended. Table 1 shows the extent of implementation for elementary teachers; Table 2 portrays the information for secondary teachers.

Table 1

Users and Nonusers of Three Writing Aspects For Elementary Teachers

	Writing Process	Peer Response Groups	Teacher Writing With Students	Totals
Non-Users	2	16	12	30
Users	18	4	8	30
Totals	20	20	20	60

Note. $X^2 = 20.8$
df = 2

Table 2

Users and Nonusers of the Three Writing Aspects For Secondary Teachers

	Writing Process	Peer Response Groups	Teacher Writing With Students	Totals
Non-users	8	10	10	28
Users	12	10	10	32
Totals	20	20	20	60

Note. $X^2 = 0.5$
df = 2

The next two tables portray the extent of implementation, differentiated by workshop mode, for elementary and secondary school teachers. Table 3 shows the extent to which elementary teachers implemented the BAWP components for each of the three workshop modes and for the control group. Table 4 shows the same information for secondary teachers.

For elementary teachers (Table 3), differences in implementation by workshop mode are statistically significant. Moreover, inspection of Table 3 shows that extent of implementation varies directly with the intensity of the workshop mode. While the differences between the comparison and limited inservice groups are not great, the gap between these and the open program and to an even greater extent, the Institute group of teachers is large.

A similar pattern exist for secondary teachers (Table 4). Differences in extent of implementation by workshop mode were statistically significant. Moreover, inspection of the table show that intensity of workshop mode was directly related to the extent of implementation. While there was no difference between the comparison group and the limited inservice mode in terms of extent of implementation, differences between these groups and the two more intensive modes of staff development were substantial.

The last research question focuses on how staff development features, local organizational factors or the nature of technical assistance influence the extent and nature of implementation of

Table 3

Elementary Teacher Use and Nonuse of BAWP Writing Components by Staff Development Mode

	Comparison	Limited Inservice	Open Program	Institute
Nonusers	11	9	6	2
Users	4	6	9	13

Note. $X^2 = 12.3$
$df = 3$

Table 4

Secondary Teacher Use and Nonuse of the BAWP Writing Components by Staff Development Mode

	Comparison	Limited Inservice	Open Program	Institute
Nonusers	11	11	7	1
Users	4	4	8	14

Note. $X^2 = 17.846$
$df = 3$

the three components of BAWP: the writing process, peer response groups, and the teacher writing with the students. These patterns will be summarized for elementary and secondary teachers.

At the Limited Inservice level, teachers appreciated the practical aspects of the workshop. The enthusiastic presentations by their teaching peers motivated them to experiment with new strategies in their own classrooms and with their own personal writing. Open program participants generally thought the course gave them more confidence, a wider vision concerning writing, and helped them teach more systematically. They also reported encouraging more writing in their classrooms due to Writing Project inservice.

Institute respondents valued the inservice as an academic as well as an emotional experience that left them with a sense of belonging to a project group that extended beyond their local school. The Institute brought participants out of some of the isolation of teaching into a network of respected colleagues that went beyond their own local school and into the entire Germany region. This larger group membership was valued by all Institute respondents.

All respondents at the Institute level believed that a sense of renewal, a revitalization, had taken place in their teaching strategies as a result of the Writing Project. A majority of both the Limited Inservice and Open Program respondents sensed this same reawakening after their Writing Project inservice.

The difference between staff development modes seemed to be in duration of the effect. Limited Inservice and Open Program participants responded with remembered enthusiasm after the inservice that had recharged them for a time, but Institute participants seemed to display a longer lasting revitalization in their teaching.

At the secondary level, Institute teachers were unanimous in their feelings that they had developed or created new strategies and methods of teaching writing and obtained a spirit of inventiveness since attending the inservice. Four of the five elementary teachers from the Institute level reported creating new strategies. Responses from the Limited Inservice and Open Program participants were not unanimous, but a clear majority from each level thought they had developed or created new methods for teaching writing.

The clarity, practicality, and quality of the Writing Project inservice were three factors which users at all levels appreciated. Usable classroom ideas and procedures were presented by peers in an understandable fashion. Respondents valued the less theoretical, more practical approach of teachers teaching teachers.

At the Limited Inservice level respondents also mentioned congruence, instrumentality, and cost factors as being influential. Techniques presented by fellow teachers seemed to fit well into the respondents' repertoires. Time-saving evaluation methods and creative activities were reported

especially helpful.

Complexity was a factor that influenced implementation at the Open Program and Institute levels. Teachers stated that their philosophies of teaching composition were changing due to the Writing Project. At the Institute level the complexity factor was profound. Respondents at this level discussed the influence of the Writing Project inservice at length. Teachers believed that they had put a great deal into the inservice and were reaping the benefits.

Local organizational and BAWP technical assistance strategies also were an influence in implementing the selected BAWP components. At the elementary school level teaming, scheduling, and lack of a schoolwide commitment to writing hindered implementation of new writing strategies, while open classrooms, parental feedback, and administrative support help implementation. At the secondary level overloaded classes, lack of positive feedback, scope of curriculum, uninformed administrators, class scheduling, and staff turnover hindered implementation of new Writing Project strategies, while collegial support, flexible curriculum, and a supportive administrative team helped implementation.

An important finding is that elementary and secondary teachers who attended the Institute, and to a lesser degree, The Open Program were able to overcome these obstacles while Limited Inservice teachers clearly were not able to do so. Institute teachers were able to generate or adapt curriculum and often get

it approved, overcome problems of large class size, obtain administrator support or at least circumvent the problem and sustain implementation. Institute teachers were able to do this across all three components of BAWP innovation.

Finally teachers with Limited Inservice were not aware of a writing project network; therefore, it neither helped nor hindered implementation. Open Program participants were generally neutral in determining the assistance or lack of assistance from the Germany Writing Project Network. Institute teachers considered themselves members of the Germany Writing Project Network and they believed it had been of assistance; however, they agreed it could be stronger in offering support.

Discussion

The study has found that the extent of implementation of the BAWP components is clearly linked to the intensity of the staff development mode. Intense of staff development mode is directly related to the percentage of participants who are users of the component as well as to the stability, durability and quality of implementation of the components. The findings include many reasons for the success of the Summer Institute and the Open Program. These reasons for success can now be examined against the staff development literature.

Sparks (1983) and Joyce and Showers (1982) present similar models of effective staff development. Sparks describes an effective sequence of staff development activities as including: a) diagnosing and prescribing, b) giving information and

demonstrating, c) discussion application, d) practicing and giving feedback, and e) coaching. Joyce and Showers describe a similar set of steps including: a) presenting theory/information, b) demonstrating/modeling, c) practicing, d) obtaining feedback, d) and coaching for application. The comparison of the BAWP summer institute and these staff development models can be summarized as follows:

1. The Institute is far less a training model where a trainer delivers training to learners than it is a structured experience where sets of learners teach each other facilitated by acknowledged leaders. At the same time, BAWP does have a set of guiding tenets which were described earlier in this paper, and participants are socialized into general agreement with these.

2. The Institute is very collegial and organic throughout the staff development process; the staff development models become increasingly collegial as the model progresses.

3. The Institute model is far less linear than these staff development models imply in the order of presentation of theory, modeling, practice, and feedback. Even so, the Institute provides all four of these components, but in different form. The Limited Inservice BAWP was practical in that it focused on what teachers wanted to know-- and this wasn't sufficient. The Institute and the staff development models were practical but also provided practice of the practical and linked the practical to the conceptual understanding of the innovation as a whole.

4. Both the Institute and the staff development models emphasize the importance of follow-up, including "peer assistance style" coaching and the use of expert coaches. Yet, in the follow-up phase, neither approach emphasizes the organizational context of the implementation such as is found in the Huberman and Miles (1984) view of implementation.

While the message from the BAWP Summer Institutes is that effective staff development does not have to look like mechanistic training, the Institute also shows how the characteristics from the staff development models can be adapted

and illustrated by the Institute approach. In many ways, the Institute does not disprove the staff development literature as it does enrich it with another successful variant.

The BAWP staff development modes also have implication for the notion of a teacher paradigm shift. The problem of making a paradigm shift is not the problem of understanding some terribly complex set of ideas. Understanding writing as a process, the teacher as writer, and the use of peer response groups is not like trying to understand the mathematical expression of Einstein's theory of relativity. Instead, the paradigm shift was an shift that represented something very new for that teacher. The shift typically: a) evolved over time, b) linked concepts and practice in an integrated manner so the teacher understood "it" and could do "it", and c) solved context problems of curriculum/instructional integration with other aspects of the teachers job and the administrative context in which the teacher worked. The best of the BAWP staff development approaches illustrate how such paradigm shifts can be made.

References

Bussis, A. M., Chittenden, E. A., & Amarel, M. (1976). Beyond the surface curriculum. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Crandall, D. P., Bauchner, J. E., Loucks, S. F., & Schmidt, W. H. (1982, March). Models of the school improvement process: Factors contributing to success. A paper presented at the American Educational Research Association in New York.

Doyle, W., & Ponder, G. (1977-78). The practicality ethic in teacher decision making. Interchange, 8(3), 1-12.

Duffy, G., & Roehler, L. (1986). Constraints on teacher change. Journal of teacher education, 37(1), 55-58.

Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M., & Pomfret, A. (1977). Research on curriculum and instruction implementation. Review of educational research, 47(1), 335-97.

Gray, J. (1983, July 23). Personal interview, San Francisco, CA: University of California, Berkeley.

Hall, G. (1974, February). The concerns-based adoption model: A developmental conceptualization of the adoption process within educational institutions. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas at Austin.

Hall, G., & Loucks, S. F. (1977). A developmental model for determining whether the treatment is actually implemented. American educational research journal, 14, 263-276.

Hall, G., & Loucks, S. (1978, November). Innovation configurations: Analyzing the adaptions of innovations. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas at Austin.

Huberman, M. & Miles, M. (1984).Innovation up close: How school improvement works. New York: Plenum.

Joyce, B., & Showers B. (1980). Improving inservice training: The messages of research. Educational leadership, 37, 379-385.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. Educational leadership, 40, 4-7.

Knudsen, D. J., & Knudsen, G. A. (1985). An examination of the training transfer of a multidimensional writing innovation. Unpublished dissertation, University of Southern California.

Loucks, S. (1977, April). Levels of use of the innovation: The conceptualization and measurement of a variable useful for assessing innovation implementation by individuals. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in New York.

Loucks, S., Newlove, B., & Hall, G. (1975, April). Measuring levels of use of the innovation: A concerns-based approach. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in San Francisco.

Marsh, D. D. (1987, April). Curriculum change strategies in secondary schools: An extension of the California School Improvement Study. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Washington, D.C.

Scriven, M. (1979). Executive summary: Overview of the Bay Area Writing Project evaluation. New York: The Carnegie Corporation.

Showers, B. (1985). Teachers coaching teachers. Educational leadership, 42(7), 43-49.

Sparks, G. M. (1983). Synthesis of research on staff development for effective teaching. Educational leadership, 41(3), 65-72.